

Official

REMARKS

7/9/03

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 8-12, 14-18, 22, 23, 27 and 28 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,848,413 issued to Wolff, et al. (*Wolff*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,978,477 issued to Hull, et al. (*Hull*) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,188,673 issued to Bauer, et al. (*Bauer*).

Claim 1 recites:

a multifunction machine to supply multiple electronic documents that have been saved in the absence of an explicit command by a user to save the electronic documents and in response to another user specified function associated with the electronic documents;

a filter coupled with the multifunction machine to transform a subset of the electronic documents for publication over a network, wherein the electronic documents not included in the subset are not published with the subset of electronic documents; and

a server coupled to the filter, the server having memory to store the electronic documents, the server to publish the subset of electronic documents by selectively permitting access to the subset of electronic documents.

Thus, the filter transforming a subset of the captured electronic documents for publication and the server selectively providing access to published documents. The electronic documents included in the subset are published while the electronic documents not in the subset are not published with the electronic documents that are in the subset.

Bauer is not described in the detailed rejection of claim 1. *Bauer* was previously cited to teach a limitation that was removed from claim 1 in the previous response. Therefore, Applicants assume that the rejection of claim 1 is based on *Wolff* and *Hull* alone.

Application No. 09/398,229
Atty. Docket No. 074451.P100

-8-

Examiner Kimberly D. Flynn
Art Unit 2153

The section of *Wolff* cited in the Office Action discloses a gateway that receives a fax document and transforms the fax document to a hypertext document. See col. 7, lines 29-20 and 40-44. The documents are stored and identifiers are provided. See col. 7, lines 58-60. However, *Wolff* does not disclose publication of a subset of the captured documents. That is, *Wolff* does not suggest a distinction between captured documents that are published and captured documents that are not published. Therefore, *Wolff* does not disclose the filter that allows a subset of electronic documents to be published and other documents not in the subset of document are not published with the subset of documents.

Hull is cited to teach storing documents without user intervention. See col. 6, lines 49-51. Thus, *Hull* discloses archival of documents. However, *Hull* does not disclose publication of a subset of the archived documents that are saved without user intervention. That is, *Hull* does not suggest a distinction between captured documents that are published and captured documents that are not published. Moreover, *Hull* does not disclose the filter discussed above.

Therefore, neither *Wolff* nor *Hull* disclose publication of a subset of captured electronic documents and selective access to published documents that have been saved without an explicit user command. Thus, no combination of *Wolff* and *Hull* teaches or suggests the invention as claimed in claim 1.

Bauer is cited to teach maintaining access logs on a server that provides access to electronic documents. Whether or not *Bauer* discloses access logs, nothing in *Bauer* teaches or suggests publication of a subset of captured electronic documents as discussed above. Therefore, *Bauer* does not cure the deficiencies of *Wolff* and *Hull*.

Claims 3, 4 and 8-12 depend from claim 1. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 3, 4 and 8-12 are similarly not rendered obvious by *Wolff*, *Hull* and *Bauer*.

Claim 14 recites:

a multifunction machine saving a copy of multiple electronic documents to a server in the absence of an explicit command by a user and in response to another user specified function associated with the electronic documents;

selecting a subset of the multiple saved electronic documents for publication over a network, wherein the electronic documents not included in the subset are not published with the subset of electronic documents;

sending a network document identifier and password for accessing the subset of electronic documents to predetermined recipients; and
providing access to the subset of electronic documents using the network documents identifier and password.

Thus, Applicants claim publication of a subset of electronic documents and providing a network identifier and password to allow a recipient to access the published documents.

As discussed above, neither *Wolff* nor *Hull* disclose publication of a subset of the electronic documents that have been saved without an explicit user command and *Bauer* does not teach publication of documents. Thus, no combination of *Wolff*, *Hull* and *Bauer* teaches or suggests the invention as claimed in claim 14.

Claims 15 and 16 depend from claim 14. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 15 and 16 are similarly not rendered obvious by *Wolff*, *Hull* and *Bauer*.

Claim 17 is directed to a computer-implemented method and recites:

receiving multiple electronic documents at a server that have been saved in the absence of an explicit command by a user to save the electronic documents and in response to another user specified function associated with the electronic documents;

selecting a subset of the multiple saved electronic documents for publication over a network, wherein the electronic documents not included

in the subset are not published with the subset of electronic documents;
and

the server allowing access to a selected subset of the electronic documents by using a security key and a document resource identifier.

Thus, Applicants claim use of a server that receives documents that have been saved in the absence of an explicit command and selectively publishes the documents by allowing access to a selected subset of the electronic documents. Claim 22 is a means-plus-function claim that recites similar limitations. Claim 28 is directed to an article of manufacture having one or more recordable media and recites similar limitations.

As discussed above, neither *Wolff* nor *Hull* disclose selective publication of electronic documents that have been saved without an explicit user command and *Bauer* does not teach publication of documents. Thus, no combination of *Wolff*, *Hull* and *Bauer* teaches or suggests a server that selectively provides access to the electronic documents as claimed in claims 17, 22 and 28.

Claim 18 depends from claim 17. Claims 23, 24 and 27 depend from claim 22. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 18, 23, 24 and 27 are similarly not rendered obvious by *Wolff*, *Hull* and *Bauer*.

Claims 5-7, 19-21 and 24-26 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Wolff* in view of *Hull* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,317,777 issued to Skarbo, et al. (*Skarbo*). *Skarbo* is cited to teach auto-deletion of an electronic document. Whether or not *Skarbo* discloses auto-deletion, *Skarbo* does not cure the deficiencies of *Wolff* and *Hull* as described above. Therefore, no combination of *Wolff*, *Hull* and *Skarbo* teaches or suggests the invention as claimed in claims 5-7, 19-21 and 24-26.

official

7/9/03

Claim 13

Applicants note that claim 13 was not rejected in the Final Office Action mailed April 9, 2003. Therefore, Applicants assume that claim 13 contains allowable subject matter.


Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1 and 3-28 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: July 9, 2003


Paul A. Mendonsa
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 684-6200